Software Design, Modelling and Analysis in UML

Lecture 12: Core State Machines II

2015-12-15

Prof. Dr. Andreas Podelski, **Dr. Bernd Westphal**

Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg, Germany

Contents & Goals

Last Lecture:

- Basic causality model
- Ether/event pool
- System configuration

This Lecture:

- **Educational Objectives:** Capabilities for following tasks/questions.
  - What does this State Machine mean? What happens if I inject this event?
  - Can you please model the following behaviour.
  - What is: Signal, Event, Ether, Transformer, Step, RTC.

- **Content:**
  - System configuration cont'd
  - Transformers
  - Step, Run-to-Completion Step

System Configuration

System Configuration

Definition. Let $\mathscr{S}_0 = (\mathscr{T}_0, \mathscr{C}_0, V_0, atr_0, \mathscr{E})$ be a signature with signals, $\mathscr{D}_0$ a structure of $\mathscr{S}_0$, $(Eth, ready, \oplus, \ominus, [\,\cdot\,])$ an ether over $\mathscr{S}_0$ and $\mathscr{D}_0$.

Furthermore assume there is one core state machine M_C per class $C \in \mathscr{C}$.

A system configuration over $\mathscr{S}_0$, $\mathscr{D}_0$, and Eth is a pair

$$(\sigma, \varepsilon) \in \Sigma^{\mathscr{D}}_{\mathscr{S}} \times Eth$$

where

- $\mathscr{S} = (\mathscr{T}_0 \,\dot\cup\, \{S_{M_C} \mid C \in \mathscr{C}_0\}, \quad \mathscr{C}_0,$

$$\begin{aligned} & V_0 \,\dot\cup\, \{\langle stable : Bool, -, \mathit{true}, \emptyset\rangle\} \\ & \quad \dot\cup\, \{\langle st_C : S_{M_C}, +, s_0, \emptyset\rangle \mid C \in \mathscr{C}\} \\ & \quad \dot\cup\, \{\langle params_E : E_{0,1}, +, \emptyset, \emptyset\rangle \mid E \in \mathscr{E}_0\}, \\ & \{C \mapsto atr_0(C) \\ & \quad \cup\, \{stable, st_C\} \cup \{params_E \mid E \in \mathscr{E}_0\} \mid C \in \mathscr{C}\}, \quad \mathscr{E}_0) \end{aligned}$$

- $\mathscr{D} = \mathscr{D}_0 \,\dot\cup\, \{S_{M_C} \mapsto S(M_C) \mid C \in \mathscr{C}\}$, and
- $\sigma(u)(r) \cap \mathscr{D}(\mathscr{E}_0) = \emptyset$ for each $u \in \mathrm{dom}(\sigma)$ and $r \in V_0$.

System Configuration: Example



$\mathcal{SM}_C$:



$\mathscr{S}_0 = (\mathscr{T}_0, \mathscr{C}_0, V_0, atr_0, \mathscr{E}),\ \mathscr{D}_0; \qquad (\sigma, \varepsilon) \in \Sigma^{\mathscr{D}}_{\mathscr{S}} \times Eth$ where

- $\mathscr{S} = (\mathscr{T}_0 \dot\cup \{S_{M_C} \mid C \in \mathscr{C}\},\quad \mathscr{C}_0,$
  $V_0 \dot\cup \{\langle stable : Bool, -, \mathit{true}, \emptyset\rangle\} \dot\cup \{\langle st_C : S_{M_C}, +, s_0, \emptyset\rangle \mid C \in \mathscr{C}\}$
  $\dot\cup \{\langle params_E : E_{0,1}, +, \emptyset, \emptyset\rangle \mid E \in \mathscr{E}_0\},$
  $\{C \mapsto atr_0(C) \cup \{stable, st_C\} \cup \{params_E \mid E \in \mathscr{E}_0\} \mid C \in \mathscr{C}\},\quad \mathscr{E}_0)$
- $\mathscr{D} = \mathscr{D}_0 \dot\cup \{S_{M_C} \mapsto S(M_C) \mid C \in \mathscr{C}\}$, and
- $\sigma(u)(r) \cap \mathscr{D}(\mathscr{E}_0) = \emptyset$ for each $u \in \mathrm{dom}(\sigma)$ and $r \in V_0$.

$\mathscr{S}_0 = (\{Int\},$
$\{C\},$
$\{x: Int, b: Int,$
$a: Int, c: C_{0,1}\},$
$\{C \mapsto \{x\},$
$E \mapsto \{b, c\},$
$F \mapsto \{a\}\},$
$\{E, F\})$

$\mathscr{S} = (\{Int, Bool, S_{M_C}\},$
$\{C\},$
$\{x: Int, b: Int,$
$a: Int, c: C_{0,1},$
$stable: Bool,$
$st_C: S_{M_C},$
$params_E: E_{0,1},$
$params_F: F_{0,1}\},$
$\{C \mapsto \{x, st_C,$
$stable, params_E,$
$params_F\},$
$E \mapsto \{b, c\},$
$F \mapsto \{a\}\},$
$\{E, F\})$

$\mathscr{D}(S_{M_C}) = \{s_1, s_2, s_3\}$

$\sigma \in \Sigma^{\mathscr{D}}_{\mathscr{S}}$:



System Configuration Step-by-Step

- We start with some signature with signals $\mathscr{S}_0 = (\mathscr{T}_0, \mathscr{C}_0, V_0, atr_0, \mathscr{E})$.
- A **system configuration** is a pair (σ, ε) which comprises a system state σ wrt. $\mathscr{S}$ (not wrt. $\mathscr{S}_0$).
- Such a **system state** σ wrt. $\mathscr{S}$ provides, for each object $u \in \mathrm{dom}(\sigma)$,
  - values for the **explicit attributes** in V_0,
  - values for a number of **implicit attributes**, namely
    - a **stability flag**, i.e. $\sigma(u)(stable)$ is a boolean value,
    - a **current (state machine) state**, i.e. $\sigma(u)(st)$ denotes one of the states of core state machine M_C,
    - a temporary association to access **event parameters** for each class, i.e. $\sigma(u)(params_E)$ is defined for each $E \in \mathscr{E}$.
- For convenience require: there is **no link to an event** except for $params_E$.

Stability

Definition.
Let (σ, ε) be a system configuration over some $\mathscr{S}_0$, $\mathscr{D}_0$, Eth.

We call an object $u \in \mathrm{dom}(\sigma) \cap \mathscr{D}(\mathscr{C}_0)$ stable in σ if and only if

$$\sigma(u)(stable) = \mathit{true}.$$

And unstable otherwise.

Where are we?



$\mathcal{SM}_C$:





$:\mathcal{SM}_D$



Transformer

Recall

- The (simplified) syntax of transition annotations:

$$annot ::= [\quad \langle event \rangle \quad [\ \text{`[' } \langle guard \rangle \text{ `]'}\ ] \quad [\ \text{`/' } \langle action \rangle]\quad]$$

- **Clear**: $\langle event \rangle$ is from $\mathscr{E}$ of the corresponding signature.
- **But:** What are $\langle guard \rangle$ and $\langle action \rangle$?
  - UML can be viewed as being **parameterized** in **expression language** (providing $\langle guard \rangle$) and **action language** (providing $\langle action \rangle$).
  - **Examples**:
    - **Expression Language**:
      - OCL
      - Java, C++, . . . expressions
      - . . .
    - **Action Language**:
      - UML Action Semantics, "Executable UML"
      - Java, C++, . . . statements (plus some event send action)
      - . . .

Needed: Semantics

$I[\![expr]\!](\sigma, u) :=$
$\begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } I_{OCL}[\![expr]\!](\sigma, \{self \mapsto u\}) = 1 \\ 0, & \text{if } I_{OCL}[\![expr]\!](\sigma, \{self \mapsto u\}) = 0 \\ \text{undefined}, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$

In the following, we assume that we're **given**

- an **expression language** $Expr$ for guards, and
- an **action language** Act for actions,

and that we're **given**

- a **semantics** for boolean expressions in form of a partial function

$$I[\![\cdot]\!](\cdot,\cdot) : Expr \times \Sigma^{\mathscr{D}}_{\mathscr{S}} \times \mathscr{D}(\mathscr{C}) \nrightarrow \mathbb{B}$$

  which evaluates expressions in a given system configuration,

  Assuming I to be partial is a way to treat "undefined" during runtime. If I is not defined (for instance because of dangling-reference navigation or division-by-zero), we want to go to a designated "error" system configuration.

- a **transformer** for each action: for each $act \in Act$, we assume to have

$$t_{act} \subseteq \mathscr{D}(\mathscr{C}) \times (\Sigma^{\mathscr{D}}_{\mathscr{S}} \times Eth) \times (\Sigma^{\mathscr{D}}_{\mathscr{S}} \times Eth)$$

Transformer

Definition.
Let $\Sigma^{\mathscr{D}}_{\mathscr{S}}$ the set of system configurations over some $\mathscr{S}_0$, $\mathscr{D}_0$, Eth.

We call a relation

$$t \subseteq \mathscr{D}(\mathscr{C}) \times (\Sigma^{\mathscr{D}}_{\mathscr{S}} \times Eth) \times (\Sigma^{\mathscr{D}}_{\mathscr{S}} \times Eth)$$

a (system configuration) **transformer**.

Example:

- $t[u_x](\sigma, \varepsilon) \subseteq \Sigma^{\mathscr{D}}_{\mathscr{S}} \times Eth$ is
  - the set (!) of the **system configurations**
  - which **may** result from **object** u_x
  - **executing** transformer t.
- $t_{\texttt{skip}}[u_x](\sigma, \varepsilon) = \{(\sigma, \varepsilon)\}$
- $t_{\texttt{create}}[u_x](\sigma, \varepsilon)$: add a previously non-alive object to σ

Observations

- In the following, we assume that
  - each application of a transformer t
  - to some system configuration (σ, ε)
  - for object u_x

  is associated with a set of **observations**

$$Obs_t[u_x](\sigma, \varepsilon) \in 2^{(\mathscr{D}(\mathscr{E}) \,\dot\cup\, \{*,+\}) \times \mathscr{D}(\mathscr{C})}.$$

- An observation

$$(u_e, u_{dst}) \in Obs_t[u_x](\sigma, \varepsilon)$$

  represents the information that,
  as a "side effect" of object u_x executing t in system configuration (σ, ε),
  the event u_e has been sent to u_{dst}.

  Special cases: creation ('$*$') / destruction ('$+$').

A Simple Action Language

In the following we use

$$Act_{\mathscr{S}} = \{\texttt{skip}\}$$

$$\cup \{\texttt{update}(expr_1, v, expr_2) \mid expr_1, expr_2 \in Expr_{\mathscr{S}}, v \in atr\}$$

$$\cup \{\texttt{send}(E(expr_1, ..., expr_n), expr_{dst}) \mid expr_i, expr_{dst} \in Expr_{\mathscr{S}}, E \in \mathscr{E}\}$$

$$\cup \{\texttt{create}(C, expr, v) \mid C \in \mathscr{C}, expr \in Expr_{\mathscr{S}}, v \in V\}$$

$$\cup \{\texttt{destroy}(expr) \mid expr \in Expr_{\mathscr{S}}\}$$

and OCL expressions over $\mathscr{S}$ (with partial interpretation) as $Expr_{\mathscr{S}}$.

Transformer Examples: Presentation

abstract syntax **concrete syntax**

op

intuitive semantics

...

well-typedness

...

semantics

$$((\sigma, \varepsilon), (\sigma', \varepsilon')) \in t_{\mathsf{op}}[u_x] \text{ iff } \ldots$$

or

$$t_{\mathsf{op}}[u_x](\sigma, \varepsilon) = \{(\sigma', \varepsilon') \mid \text{ where } \ldots\}$$

observables

$$Obs_{\mathsf{op}}[u_x] = \{\ldots\}$$

(error) conditions

Not defined if ...

Transformer: Skip

abstract syntax	**concrete syntax**
`skip`	*skip*
intuitive semantics	
do nothing	
well-typedness	
$./.$	
semantics	
$t_{\texttt{skip}}[u_x](\sigma, \varepsilon) = \{(\sigma, \varepsilon)\}$	
observables	
$Obs_{\texttt{skip}}[u_x](\sigma, \varepsilon) = \emptyset$	
(error) conditions	

Transformer: Update

abstract syntax

$\texttt{update}(expr_1, v, expr_2)$

concrete syntax

$expr_1.v := expr_2$

intuitive semantics

Update attribute v in the object denoted by $expr_1$ to the value denoted by $expr_2$.

well-typedness

$expr_1 : T_C$ and $v : T \in atr(C)$; $\quad expr_2 : T$;

$expr_1, expr_2$ obey visibility and navigability

semantics

$$t_{\texttt{update}(expr_1,v,expr_2)}[u_x](\sigma, \varepsilon) = \{(\sigma', \varepsilon)\}$$

where $\sigma' = \sigma[u \mapsto \sigma(u)[v \mapsto I[\![expr_2]\!](\sigma, u_x)]]$ with

$$u = I[\![expr_1]\!](\sigma, u_x).$$

observables

$$Obs_{\texttt{update}(expr_1,v,expr_2)}[u_x] = \emptyset$$

(error) conditions

Not defined if $I[\![expr_1]\!](\sigma, u_x)$ or $I[\![expr_2]\!](\sigma, u_x)$ not defined.

Update Transformer Example

$\mathcal{SM}_C$:



self.x := self.x + 1

expr1 v expr2

$$t_{\texttt{update}(expr_1,v,expr_2)}[u_x](\sigma,\varepsilon) = (\sigma' = \sigma[u \mapsto \sigma(u)[v \mapsto I[\![expr_2]\!](\sigma,u_x)]], \varepsilon),\ u = I[\![expr_1]\!](\sigma,u_x)$$

exactly attribute v changes

σ:

$u_1 : C$
$x = 4$
$y = 0$
st = s_1
stable = 0

$t_{update}[u_1]$

$:\sigma'$

$u_1 : C$
$x = 5$
$y = 0$
st = s_1
stable = 0

ε:



- $u = I[\![self]\!](\sigma, u_1) =: \beta$
  $= I_{acc}[\![self]\!](\sigma, \{self \mapsto u_1\})$
  $= u_1$
- $I[\![self.x + 1]\!](\sigma, \beta)$
  $= I[\![+(x(self), 1)]\!](\sigma, \beta) = I(+)(I[\![x(self)]\!](\sigma,\beta), I(1))$
  $= I(+)(u_1, I(1)) = u_1 + 1 = 5$



$:\varepsilon' = \varepsilon$

Transformer: Send

abstract syntax **concrete syntax**

$\texttt{send}(E(expr_1, ..., expr_n), expr_{dst})$

expr_dst ! E(expr_1, ..., expr_n)

intuitive semantics

Object $u_x : C$ sends event E to object $expr_{dst}$, i.e. create a fresh signal instance, fill in its attributes, and place it in the ether.

well-typedness

$E \in \mathscr{E};\ atr(E) = \{v_1 : T_1, \ldots, v_n : T_n\};\ expr_i : T_i,\ 1 \leq i \leq n;$
$expr_{dst} : T_D,\ C, D \in \mathscr{C} \setminus \mathscr{E};$
all expressions obey visibility and navigability in C

semantics

$$(\sigma', \varepsilon') \in t_{\texttt{send}(E(expr_1,...,expr_n),expr_{dst})}[u_x](\sigma, \varepsilon)$$

new signal instance

① if $\sigma' = \sigma \dot\cup \{u \mapsto \{v_i \mapsto d_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq n\}\};\quad \varepsilon' = \varepsilon \oplus (u_{dst}, u);$

if $u_{dst} = I[\![expr_{dst}]\!](\sigma, u_x) \in \mathrm{dom}(\sigma);\quad d_i = I[\![expr_i]\!](\sigma, u_x)$ for $1 \leq i \leq n;$

$u \in \mathscr{D}(E)$ a fresh identity, i.e. $u \notin \mathrm{dom}(\sigma)$,

② and where $(\sigma', \varepsilon') = (\sigma, \varepsilon)$ if $u_{dst} \notin \mathrm{dom}(\sigma)$.

} sending to a non-alive object: do nothing

observables

$$Obs_{\texttt{send}}[u_x] = \{(u, u_{dst})\}$$

(error) conditions

$I[\![expr]\!](\sigma, u_x)$ not defined for any $expr \in \{expr_{dst}, expr_1, \ldots, expr_n\}$

Send Transformer Example

$\mathcal{SM}_C$:





$t_{\texttt{send}(expr_{src},E(expr_1,\ldots,expr_n),expr_{dst})}[u_x](\sigma,\varepsilon) \ni (\sigma',\varepsilon')$ iff $\varepsilon' = \varepsilon \oplus (u_{dst}, u)$;

$\sigma' = \sigma \dot\cup \{u \mapsto \{v_i \mapsto d_i \mid 1 \le i \le n\}\}$; $u_{dst} = I[\![expr_{dst}]\!](\sigma, u_x) \in \mathrm{dom}(\sigma)$;

$d_i = I[\![expr_i]\!](\sigma, u_x)$, $1 \le i \le n$; $u \in \mathscr{D}(E)$ a fresh identity;



Sequential Composition of Transformers

$act_1 ; act_2$

$t_{act_2}(t_{act_1}(\cdot))$

- **Sequential composition** $t_1 \circ t_2$ of transformers t_1 and t_2 is canonically defined as

$$(t_2 \circ t_1)[u_x](\sigma, \varepsilon) = t_2[u_x](t_1[u_x](\sigma, \varepsilon))$$

with observation

$$Obs_{(t_2 \circ t_1)}[u_x](\sigma, \varepsilon) = Obs_{t_1}[u_x](\sigma, \varepsilon) \cup Obs_{t_2}[u_x](t_1(\sigma, \varepsilon)).$$

- **Clear**: not defined if one the two intermediate "micro steps" is not defined.

Transformers And Denotational Semantics

Observation: our transformers are in principle the **denotational semantics** of the actions/action sequences. The trivial case, to be precise.

Note: with the previous examples, we can capture

- empty statements, skips,
- assignments,
- conditionals (by normalisation and auxiliary variables),
- create/destroy (later),

but not **possibly diverging loops**.



Our (Simple) Approach: if the action language is, e.g. Java, then (**syntactically**) forbid loops and calls of recursive functions.

Other Approach: use full blown denotational semantics.

No show-stopper, because loops in the action annotation can be converted into transition cycles in the state machine.

References

References

Harel, D. and Gery, E. (1997). Executable object modeling with statecharts. *IEEE Computer*, 30(7):31–42.

OMG (2011a). Unified modeling language: Infrastructure, version 2.4.1. Technical Report formal/2011-08-05.

OMG (2011b). Unified modeling language: Superstructure, version 2.4.1. Technical Report formal/2011-08-06.